

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, the Specification and claims 1, 6, 8, 16-18, and 21-23 have been amended, claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 19, 20, and 24-29 have been cancelled, and new claim 30 has been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 13-18, 21-23, and 30 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In the outstanding Office Action at page 2, the Examiner objects to the Specification because of an informality. Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification has been amended to correct the deficiency noted by the Examiner, thus resolving this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 8-10, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,347 to Knowles, et al. Claims 1, 8, and 16 are independent claims. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Knowles, et al. merely teaches an interactive program guide system for providing different television programming and different interactive program guides to several different users. According to Knowles, et al., access to a database is granted if a password is correctly input based on the password information managed in the database center. If the password is incorrectly input, an error screen is displayed. Further, according to Knowles, et al., the data stored in the database are input by the person who sets the password, and the database itself is not used for security purposes.

In contrast to Knowles, et al., the database in the present invention is used for security purposes. Amended independent claim 1 recites, in relevant part, "a processing part configured to detect a password input error and to register information of the information processing apparatus by making a transmission to a first database of a registration center when the

password input error is detected, and to store transmission log information related to the transmission to the registration center into said storage unit." Amended independent claim 8 recites, in relevant part, "detecting a password error at the information processing apparatus" and "registering information of the information processing apparatus by making a transmission to a first database of a registration center when the password input error is detected." Amended independent 16 recites, in relevant part, "causing the computer to detect a password input error" and "causing the computer to register information of the computer by making a transmission to a first database of the registration center when the password input error is detected." Thus, according to the present invention, the first registration to the database is triggered by a password input error. Further, the password input error is detected at the information processing apparatus, and the password information is not managed in the database (registration) center.

Applicant respectfully submits that Knowles, et al. relates to accessing predetermined data from a plurality of users (user terminals). The present invention, however, relates to the management of the security of a predetermined information processing apparatus. Thus, the databases of Knowles, et al. and the present invention have completely different uses.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of amended independent claims 1, 8, and 16 and, therefore, amended independent claims 1, 8, and 16, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the outstanding Office Action at pages 4-7, the Examiner rejects claims 3, 6, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knowles, et al. Of these claims, only claims 6, 13, and 21 are independent claims. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As claim 3 depends indirectly from amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1.

Independent claim 6 is directed to an information processing apparatus and recites "a first database configured to register information related to a first apparatus when notified of a password input error at the first apparatus, in response to a transmission from the first apparatus," "a second database configured to register the information of the first apparatus

when the information related to the first apparatus is notified from a second apparatus and the information related to the first apparatus is registered in said first database, in response to a transmission from the second apparatus," and "a processing part configured to control registration of information to and deletion of information from said first database and said second database." Independent claims 13 and 21 recite similar features. The remaining rejected claims, claims 7, 14, 17, 18, 22, and 23 depend either directly or indirectly from these independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Knowles, et al. discloses all of the features of independent claim 6, "except for a first database which records the entry of an incorrect password and a second database for recording the occurrence of the entry of an incorrect password." Similar rejections were articulated for independent claims 13 and 21. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that merely teaches an interactive program guide system for providing different television programming and different interactive program guides to several different users. According to Knowles, et al., access to a database is granted if a password is correctly input based on the password information managed in the database center. If the password is incorrectly input, an error screen is displayed. Further, according to Knowles, et al., the data stored in the database are input by the person who sets the password, and the database itself is not used for security purposes. Applicant respectfully submits that Knowles, et al. relates to accessing predetermined data from a plurality of users (user terminals). The present invention, however, relates to the management of the security of a predetermined information processing apparatus. Thus, Knowles, et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the features of the present invention.

The Examiner has taken Official Notice "that a second database is well-known and expected in the art because partitioning a database into a first database and a second database is well-known and expected in the art." Further, the Examiner asserts that a "skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Knowles, et al. to include a second database for the purpose of creating a separate database for an alarm signal for easy recognition and accessing." Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that there is no motivation to combine this second database with the teachings of Knowles, et al. The Abstract of Knowles, et al. states that "Each of the different IPGs [Interactive Program Guides] share a common database. Therefore, a first IPG being viewed by a first user can display data added or modified via a second IPG by a second user of the system." Thus, Knowles, et al. uses a single database and adding a second database, as suggested by the Examiner, would contradict the

teachings of Knowles, et al. Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion regarding "creating a separate database for an alarm signal for easy recognition and accessing." Knowles, et al. teaches that any conflicts between devices are resolved immediately, either through the common database or by prompting the user. Thus, according to Knowles, there would be no reason to store information regarding conflicts or any sort of "alarm signal."

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 3, independent claims 6, 13, and 21, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 22, 2005

By: David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501